IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.7527 of 2026

Himangshu Mahato, son of Mantu Ram Mahato, resident of village Chaunra, Birra, P.O. & P.S. Bidra, District-East Singhbhum.

..... Petitioner.

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration & Land Reforms, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, Ranchi.
2. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Dhalbhum, Jamshedpur.
4. The Circle Officer, Patamda Circle, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur.

..... Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Niraj Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Kumar Pawan, A.C. to S.C. (Mines)-III

Order No.02 **Date: 24.09.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction upon respondent no. 4, the Circle Officer, Patamda, and the other concerned revenue authorities, to forthwith proceed with and complete the demarcation proceedings in Demarcation Case No. 61 of 2025-26 with respect to the land appertaining to P.S. No. 126, Account No. 228, Plot No. 5347, situated at Mouza-Mahulvani/Madhulbani, measuring an area of 1.71 acres, strictly in accordance with the official revenue records, survey records, cadastral map and the applicable provisions of law. Further prayer has been made for issuance of direction upon the concerned respondents to fix a fresh date for demarcation within a stipulated period and to communicate the

same to the petitioner and all concerned persons by way of written notice. The petitioner has also prayed for issuance of a direction restraining the respondents from indefinitely postponing or keeping Demarcation Case No. 61 of 2025-26 pending on the basis of any oral direction or administrative communication, without passing a reasoned order.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has repeatedly represented the respondent-authorities in this regard, however, the same have remained un-responded which has compelled him to prefer the present writ petition.

3. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that although the revenue authorities are empowered to demarcate land where there exists any doubt with regard to its boundary, however, where the dispute is not with regard to the boundary, rather same relates to the right, title and interest over the land, the revenue authorities have no power to entertain an application seeking demarcation of the land. It is further observed that in the event of any dispute with regard to the right, title and interest over the land, the appropriate recourse is to seek remedy before the competent Civil Court.

4. Since the petitioner has stated in the present writ petition that he has represented the respondent authorities, including respondent no. 4, seeking demarcation of the land in question, he is given liberty to prefer a fresh representation in this regard before the said respondent. Upon receipt of such representation, the respondent no. 4, after verifying the

relevant records pertaining to the land and conducting a spot inspection, shall take an appropriate and informed decision/step in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of filing of the said representation, strictly in accordance with the observations made hereinabove.

5. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with aforesaid liberty and direction.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

***Rohit*/**
24.09.2026
Uploaded on 25.09.2026